Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Application by	)	
Qwest Communications International, Inc.	)	
For Authorization to Provide	)	
In-Region, InterLATA Services	)	WC Docket No. 03-11
In New Mexico, Oregon and South Dakota	)	

COMMENTS OF WORLDCOM, INC.

Marc A. Goldman
JENNER & BLOCK, LLC
601 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 639-6000

Lori Wright
WorldCom, Inc.
1133 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 736-6468

February 5, 2003

INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Qwest argues that approval of its section 271 applications for three additional states follows almost as a matter of course from the Commission's prior approval of applications for nine other states in its region. But that is not the case. Qwest's application for New Mexico must be rejected because Qwest fails to meet the requirements of Track A in that state. And more fundamentally, Qwest's application for each state in this application must be rejected because Qwest's OSS is even worse than the Commission previously understood.

The New Mexico Commission did not find that Qwest met the requirements of Track A, and there is no basis for this Commission to do so. There are no facilities-based providers of wireline residential service in New Mexico. The resale carriers identified by Qwest as serving the majority of residential customers in New Mexico sell primarily a pre-paid service to a small number of subscribers and are not an actual commercial alternative to Qwest. And Qwest provides insufficient evidence that more than a *de minimis* number of residential subscribers substitute Cricket PCS service for wireline service.

As for Qwest's poor OSS, WorldCom explained in response to Qwest's prior section 271 applications that Qwest's OSS has basic deficiencies that do not exist in any other region. WorldCom's experience in placing orders in the Qwest region was based on orders placed in conjunction with Z-Tel while it was developing its own systems. WorldCom explained the difficulties it was experiencing with development as a result of the cumbersome nature of Qwest's systems and Qwest's poor documentation. The Commission nevertheless concluded that Qwest's OSS was adequate.

But WorldCom has now entered the Qwest region using its own systems and discovered problems even worse than it anticipated. Because Qwest's systems differ from what Qwest explained during the course of WorldCom's development, nearly 100% of WorldCom's initial orders rejected. WorldCom was forced to shut down its systems for nearly two weeks and spend significant development resources to re-program its systems to conform to the way Qwest's OSS actually functions. In addition, there are no effective work-arounds for other problems that have been discovered. And given WorldCom's experience so far, it is almost certain that new problems will continue to be discovered.

At present, Qwest's OSS is the worst in the country and simply is not sufficient to effectively support mass market competition. This time the Commission must reject Qwest's application and require Qwest to get its OSS working properly. The Commission also must reject Qwest's application for New Mexico for failure to meet the requirements of Track A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF DECLARANTS

Tab	Declarant	Subject
1	Sherry Lichtenberg	OSS

TABLE OF CITATION FORMS

FCC ORDERS	
Kansas/Oklahoma Order	In re Joint Application by SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, and Southwestern Bell Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Southwestern Bell Long Distance for Provision of In-region, InterLATA Services in Kansas and Oklahoma, CC Docket No. 00-217, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 16 F.C.C.R. 6237, FCC 01-29 (2001), aff'd in part, remanded by, Sprint Communications Co. v. FCC, 274 F.3d 549 (D.C. Cir. 2001).
Louisiana I Order	In re Application of BellSouth Corporation, et al. Pursuant to Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Louisiana, CC Docket No. 97-231, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 13 F.C.C.R. 6245, FCC 98-17 (1998).
Louisiana II Order	In re Application of BellSouth Corporation, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., and BellSouth Long-distance, Inc., for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Louisiana, CC Docket No. 98-121, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 13 F.C.C.R. 20599, FCC 98-271 (1998).
Pennsylvania Order	In re Application of Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc. Pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Provide In-region, InterLATA Services in Pennsylvania, CC Docket No. 01-138, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 16 F.C.C.R. 17419, FCC 01-269 (2001).
Qwest I Order	In re Application by Qwest Communications International, Inc. for Authorization to Provide In-region, InterLATA Services in the States of Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming, WC Docket No. 02-314, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 2002 WL 31863801, FCC 02-332 (FCC rel. Dec. 23, 2002).

FCC ORDERS	
Vermont Order	In re Application by Verizon New England Inc., for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Vermont, CC Docket No. 02-7, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 17 F.C.C.R. 7625, FCC 02-118 (2002), appeal dismissed, AT&T Corp. v. FCC, No. 02-1152, 2002 WL 31619058 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 19, 2002)
DECLARATIONS AND AFFIDAVITS	
Lichtenberg Decl.	Declaration of Sherry Lichtenberg on Behalf of WorldCom, Inc. (attached at Tab 1)
Teitzel Decl.	Declaration of Teitzel on Behalf of Qwest Communications (Qwest Appl. App. A, Tab 4)
STATE COMMISSION MATERIALS	
New Mexico Order	In re Qwest Corporation's Section 271 Application and Motion for Alternative Procedure to Manage the Section 271 Process, Utility Case No. 3269, Final Order Regarding Compliance with Outstanding Section 271 Requirements: SGAT Compliance, Track A, and Public Interest (N.M. Pub. Reg. Comm'n Oct. 8, 2002) (Qwest Appl. App. C-New Mexico, Tab 19)

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Application by	)	
Qwest Communications International, Inc.	)	
For Authorization to Provide	)	
In-Region, InterLATA Services	)	WC Docket No. 03-11
In New Mexico, Oregon and South Dakota	)	

COMMENTS OF WORLDCOM, INC.

Qwest's section 271 application for New Mexico, Oregon, and South Dakota must be rejected. Qwest's application for New Mexico must be rejected because Qwest fails to meet the requirements of Track A in that state. There is no actual competitive alternative to Qwest for residential subscribers in New Mexico. Qwest's application for all three states must be rejected because Qwest's OSS is worse than this Commission understood when it approved Qwest's previous nine-state application. As WorldCom has attempted to enter the market using its own OSS, it has faced enormous difficulties caused primarily by the failure of Qwest's systems to conform to its documentation. Indeed, nearly 100% of WorldCom's orders were rejected when WorldCom began transmitting orders, forcing WorldCom to shut down its systems. Qwest is at fault for these problems.

I. QWEST FAILS TO MEET TRACK A IN NEW MEXICO

Qwest's section 271 application for New Mexico should be denied for failure to meet the Track A requirements of section 271. The record evidence simply does not demonstrate that competitors in New Mexico provide residential consumers with an actual commercial alternative for local service. As the New Mexico Commission explained, "…the probative value of the evidence Qwest has proffered does not bear the quality that would enable this Commission to conclude with any measure of confidence that Qwest is in compliance with section 271(c)(1)(A), *i.e.,* that Qwest has shown that competitors are serving more than a de minimis number of residential end users Qwest's service area in this State."[1] The New Mexico Commission deferred to this Commission the ultimate determination of whether Qwest meets Track A in New Mexico. This Commission should deny Qwest's application for New Mexico on Track A grounds.

In order to receive section 271 approval, a BOC must first demonstrate that it satisfies the requirements of either section 271(c)(1)(A) (Track A) or 271(c)(1)(B) (Track B).[2] Qwest contends that is satisfies the requirements of Track A in New Mexico. But that is not so. Qwest does not demonstrate that at least one competing provider constitutes an actual commercial alternative to Qwest for residential subscribers and that at least one competitor serves more than a *de minimis* number of residential subscribers.[3] Qwest argues that it satisfies this standard primarily because Cricket Communications, a PCS carrier, has a "significant number" of residential subscribers who have substituted wireless service for wireline service.[4] Qwest also notes that there is some residential resale service provided in New Mexico.[5] In neither of these situations do the underlying facts support a finding of Track A compliance.

First, the resellers identified by Qwest as providing residential competition are neither competing with Qwest for the same customers nor providing an "actual commercial alternative."

---

[1] New Mexico Order ¶ 154.
[2] 47 U.S.C. §§ 271(c)(1)(A)-(B).
[3] Vermont Order ¶10.
[4] Qwest Brief at 15.
[5] Qwest Brief at 15.

Indeed, the New Mexico Commission found as much, and the FCC should respect that Commission's judgment.

As a threshold matter, Qwest keeps confidential the identity of the CLECs that it claims offers residential resale service in New Mexico. CLECs cannot be characterized as true commercial alternatives if Qwest does not even make their identities publicly available. Next, a review of the websites of the resellers identified by Qwest indicates that they largely offer a pre-paid product targeted to a niche market consisting of customers who have been disconnected by Qwest for failure to pay or some other reason. These pre-paid service offerings do not constitute a genuine commercial alternative to Qwest, because (1) customers who have been disconnected for failure to pay cannot be reasonably said to have a choice of competing providers; and (2) the local service offerings themselves are not comparable to Qwest's, generally including significant "one-time activation fees" and local service at rates as much as three time that of Qwest. For example, one of the carrier's local service offerings includes a one-time activation fee of $40.00 and monthly service charge of $41.99, compared to Qwest's local service, which includes a $30.00 one-time set-up charge and monthly service charge of $12.25.[6] Rates more than three times as high as Qwest's do not constitute an actual commercial alternative.

Additionally, the raw number of residential resale customers in New Mexico is insignificant,[7] and has been steadily decreasing.[8] Although the number of residential resale customers in Qwest may satisfy the Commission's *de minimis* test that has been applied to facilities-based residential competition, the Commission has not established a *de minimis* standard for residential resale competition. And the Commission should not do so. After all,

---

[6] *See* www.qwest.com/pcat/for_home/product

[7] Teitzel Decl., Exhibit DLT-Track A/PI-NM-1, at 4.

[8] New Mexico Order ¶¶ 122-123.

Track A is focused on facilities-based providers. It requires the existence of competitors that provide service either exclusively or predominantly over their own facilities.[9] And while the Commission has stated in dicta that a BOC may be able to satisfy this standard if competitors serve business customers via their own facilities and residential customers via resale[10] (a situation that Qwest does not even assert exists here), it has not stated that a BOC can meet Track A when it only serves a small number of residential resale customers especially where, as here, the absence of facilities-based competition can be attributed to high UNE prices and poor OSS that existed for years. It would be inconsistent with the Commission's general focus on facilities-based competition to find Track A satisfied on such a basis. Moreover, it has now been almost seven years since passage of the Act. Unlike in early section 271 applications, the existence of a small number of customers served by competitors can no longer be said to portend the likelihood that competition will expand much more broadly.

The Commission also should reject Qwest's assertion that it faces sufficient local residential competition from Cricket Communications, which offers PCS service in Albuquerque and Santa Fe.[11] This Commission has held that BOC applicants may rely on the presence of a PCS provider to satisfy Track A only if the PCS provider "competes with the telephone exchange service offered by the applicant in the relevant state,"[12] and the PCS customers are using the PCS service to "replace wireline service, not as a supplement to wire."[13] Cricket does not meet these requirements. Indeed, the New Mexico Commission, which oversaw the Track A proceedings for almost two years, concluded that "[t]here is no single exhibit, strand of

---

[9] 47 U.S.C. § 271(c)(1)(A).

[10] Louisiana II Order ¶ 48; Kansas/Oklahoma Order ¶ 43, n.101.

[11] Qwest Brief at 16.

[12] Louisiana I Order ¶ 73.

[13] Louisiana II Order ¶ 31.

testimony or other piece of evidence that proves with any degree of reasonable certainty -- let alone evidence sufficient to fulfill the substantial evidence standard that Commission orders must satisfy -- that Qwest has met its burden of showing there is an actual and significant number of Cricket subscribers in Qwest's New Mexico territory who have substituted broadband PCS service for Qwest wireline service."[14]

In an attempt to show that at least a *de minimis* number of New Mexicans use Cricket PCS as a substitute for Qwest local residential wireline service, Qwest commissioned a polling firm to conduct a survey of Cricket PCS customers. But this survey does not qualify as evidence that a significant number of residential consumers are substituting Cricket PCS service for local wireline service. Indeed the New Mexico Commission found "significant problems inherent in the design, methodology, and implementation of the Cricket survey."[15] WorldCom agrees that the two-part survey likely resulted in an inaccurate representation of the degree to which New Mexicans actually are substituting Cricket PCS service for wireline service. For example, the relevant questions in the first part of the survey were worded such that they easily could elicit responses based on *hypothetical* behavior rather than actual customer behavior. Specifically, the first relevant question asked was, "[w]hen some people need to start phone service, they might decide to use the Cricket phone instead of having traditional wireline phone service hooked up in their home. Does this apply to you?"[16] The remaining questions were similarly worded.[17] An

---

[14] New Mexico Order ¶ 155.

[15] New Mexico Order ¶ 154.

[16] Teitzel Decl., Exhibit-DLT-Track A/PI-NM-5.

[17] The remaining questions were, "Some Cricket customers might decide that Cricket service does away with the need to have traditional wire line phone service in their home. As a result, they terminate their wireline phone services from the local phone company. Does this apply to you?;" "Thirdly, some Cricket phone users might find that having Cricket means they can cancel phone service on a second or additional telephone line in their home. Does this apply to you?;" "Lastly, some Cricket customers might find that using the Cricket service from inside their home replaces the need to add a new or additional telephone line. Does this apply to you?" Teitzel Decl., Exhibit-DLT-Track A/PI-NM-5.

affirmative answer to these questions simply indicates that in the future, if the respondents hooked up new phone service, they might consider using Cricket exclusively, not that they in fact were already doing so. The hypothetical nature of the questions and answers seriously undermines the reliability of the survey for Track A compliance purposes.

An additional follow-up question asked to the same participants several months later provides no further evidence that Cricket customers exclusively use Cricket as their local residential local provider. The additional question was: "Do you have wireline local telephone service in your home?"[18] Participants were not provided with a definition of the term "wireline," however.[19] Although the term "wireline" is part of the standard vocabulary of telecommunications professionals, it is not safe to assume that the same is true for most people. Therefore a response indicating that a customer did not have wireline service says little about whether a customer relies exclusively on wireless service; it may simply indicate a misunderstanding of the meaning of wireline service, further undermining the reliability of the study. It also bears emphasis that the raw numbers from which the results of the survey have been extrapolated were very small -- only 1,941 residential Cricket subscribers participated in the survey.[20] For these reasons WorldCom agrees with the New Mexico Commission that the Cricket survey cannot be relied on to show that Cricket PCS customers are substituting their wireline service with wireless service.

Finally, we note that WorldCom has plans to enter the New Mexico local residential market in March. The Commission, however, cannot rely on this future event for Track A

[18] Teitzel Decl., Exhibit-DLT-Track A/PI-NM-5, Direct Testimony of Keith Frederick, at 6-7.

[19] *See, e.g.,* New Mexico Order ¶ 152.

[20] Teitzel Decl., Exhibit-DLT-Track A/PI-NM-5, Direct Testimony of Keith Frederick, at 24.

approval in New Mexico, because a BOC's application must be complete when filed.[21] The FCC has made exceptions to this rule only where "special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule and such deviation will serve the public interest."[22] Such circumstances are not presented here. Qwest is fully aware of what is required under Track A. Qwest was fully in control of the decision to file for section 271 authority on January 15, 2003. Qwest was fully aware that the New Mexico Commission did not believe Qwest met Track A. Qwest nevertheless chose to file for section 271 authority when its only possible bases for demonstrating residential local competition consisted of a survey of Cricket PCS customers and the existence of a few residential resale providers offering highly-priced pre-paid products to a niche market. Qwest's Track A argument in New Mexico must stand or fall on this evidence. To rely on, or take comfort in, any potential competition from WorldCom would be inappropriate. This is especially true when the OSS difficulties WorldCom is experiencing in the Qwest territory may reduce the number of customers we would otherwise be able to serve in New Mexico. Indeed this is part of the point of Track A – to ensure that competitors actually can provide residential service to more than a *de minimis* number of customers in the state for which the BOC is seeking long distance authority. The results of our local market entry may or may not provide Qwest with a successful Track A argument, but in any case, these future events cannot be relied on in the instant application.

---

[21] *See* Updated Filing Requirements for Bell Operating Company Applications Under Section 271 of the Communications Act, DA 01-734, 17 F.C.C.R. 19056, at 3-4 (2001).

[22] Pennsylvania Order ¶ 98, citing Northeast Cellular Telephone Co. v. FCC, 897 F.2d 1164, 1166 (D.C. Cir. 1990); WAIT Radio v. FCC, 418 F.2d 1153 (D.C. Cir. 1969).

II. NEW PROBLEMS DEMONSTRATE FUNDAMENTAL DEFICIENCIES IN QWEST'S OSS

An even more fundamental deficiency in Qwest's latest section 271 application, and one that applies to all states for which Qwest has applied, is that Qwest's OSS remains fundamentally deficient. The fears WorldCom expressed in responding to Qwest's prior section 271 applications have come true. Qwest's inefficient, cumbersome pre-order and order processes and flawed documentation are causing major problems for WorldCom as it begins transmitting orders with its own systems.

WorldCom entered the Qwest region in April 2002 but used Z-Tel systems to place orders. WorldCom faced substantial problems in placing orders in the Qwest region thereafter, including reject rates that were twice as high as it experienced in other regions. And WorldCom gained a fuller understanding of the cause of these difficulties as it began developing its own interfaces last summer. WorldCom has previously described the inconsistencies and gaps in Qwest's documentation and the trial and error development process that it had to undertake. Those flaws, as well as the cumbersome nature of Qwest's systems, lengthened development time and required far more work on WorldCom's part than should have been necessary. And now that WorldCom has begun placing orders using its own systems, it is clear that these flaws are causing even bigger problems than WorldCom anticipated. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶¶ 2-3.

WorldCom began transmitting orders in the Qwest region using its own systems on January 18. Nearly 100% of WorldCom's orders have rejected as a result of problems that, for the most part, are indisputably Qwest's fault. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 5. In fact, WorldCom had to stop submitting orders for nearly two weeks in response to these problems. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶

5. And even as these problems begin to be fixed, WorldCom fully expects to find similar problems spring up in their stead.

A. Qwest Fails to Include Telephone Numbers in Feature Detail Information

WorldCom has faced rejection of nearly all of its orders. This obviously is a big problem. This has occurred for a number of different reasons. First, Qwest rejected WorldCom orders because the flawed documentation Qwest provided left WorldCom unable to obtain the feature information that it needs to place orders. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 6. As WorldCom explained in response to Qwest's last section 271 application, Qwest requires that CLECs differentiate on every order between features that a customer is ordering for the first time and features that the customer already has and wishes to retain.[23] This requires the CLEC to determine the features the customer already has. But WorldCom was not able to determine the existing features for most customers. Id.

Because a customer may have different features associated with different phone numbers, a CLEC attempting to determine what features a customer has must first associate the features with a phone number. During the course of development, WorldCom learned that Qwest does not organize its CSRs with separate sections for each telephone number. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 8. Instead, each of the customer's telephone numbers is embedded within the feature detail

[23] Qwest I Order ¶ 58. WorldCom will not here repeat its explanation that this process itself is fundamentally flawed and warrants rejection of any Qwest 271 application until it is fixed. Suffice it to say that WorldCom disagrees with the Commission that CLECs asked for this process. Qwest I Order ¶ 58. While Qwest claims it implemented the process to benefit CLECs, it was not at their request. As stated by Qwest, "[d]ue to significant issues experienced by the CLECs and their end users, related to missing features following conversions, *Qwest* modified its process to require a positive identification of the action to be taken for each existing feature." (emphasis added). Qwest I Notarianni/Doherty Reply Decl. ¶ 146. Indeed, Eschelon explicitly protested the process at the time it was implemented. In any event, WorldCom's point here is that Qwest has implemented its non-industry standard process in a manner that makes it even worse than WorldCom had anticipated.

information and must be extracted from there.[24] WorldCom therefore designed its systems to pull the customer's telephone number[s] from the feature detail information. Id.

However, when WorldCom began transmitting orders, it discovered that for most single-line customers, the telephone number is not included in the feature detail. Id. Instead, the telephone number is included elsewhere on the CSR -- except for those single-line customers who were once multi-line customers for whom the telephone number is included in the feature detail information. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 9. This is so even though Qwest's documentation is the same for single-line and multi-line CSRs. The documentation does not delineate that a CLEC should obtain the telephone number from a different place on the CSR for single-line customers than for multi-line customers and certainly does not distinguish between single-line customers who were once multi-line customers and other single-line customers. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 9.

Indeed, Qwest itself did not understand its own systems. When WorldCom first determined that the telephone numbers were missing from the feature detail information on single-line accounts, Qwest said that this was only so in its Eastern region. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 9. Only after WorldCom provided examples from Qwest's Central and Western regions did Qwest acknowledge that the problem exists across its whole region and that its documentation failed to describe the variance between single-line and multi-line CSR response information. Id.

The result has been rejection of WorldCom orders. WorldCom designed its systems to extract telephone numbers from the feature detail information, but Qwest's CSR responses did not provide the telephone number in the feature detail for most single-line customers. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 8. As a result, WorldCom could not associate features with a telephone number. The systems therefore treated all of the features the customer was ordering as new.

[24] *See* Qwest I Order ¶ 54 & n.176.

They could not differentiate between features that really were new and features the customers already had and wished to retain. Thus Qwest's systems rejected the orders. Of the initial WorldCom orders, approximately 60% were rejected because of this problem. Id.

As a result, WorldCom was forced to stop transmitting orders in order to revamp its systems to accommodate Qwest's deficient CSR responses. WorldCom stopped transmitting orders on January 21, only three days after it began transmitting orders. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 10. It took almost two weeks of work to revamp the systems during which time additional orders were building up in the pipeline. Id. WorldCom again began transmitting orders on Saturday, February 1, and WorldCom hopes that this problem has now been resolved. But such trial and error development is exactly what WorldCom warned of in response to Qwest's prior applications. It is an entirely unacceptable way to develop systems. And WorldCom fully expects that it will have to continue trial and error development as it discovers additional problems caused by flaws in Qwest's systems and documentation.

Qwest has also refused to announce the problem to other CLECs, claiming that WorldCom is the only one that has experienced it. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 12. But to the extent this is true, it can only be because few CLECs have yet developed EDI interfaces that they use to serve many single-line customers. There is no doubt that any CLECs developing EDI interfaces would need clear information on how Qwest's CSRs are organized.

Qwest has agreed that it will change its documentation eventually to reflect the actual organization of its CSRs for customers who have only a single-line, but it has not provided a date for this change. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 12. Significant OSS problems such as this should be communicated to all CLECs rather than swept under the rug. Other RBOCs would have announced such a problem immediately.

B. Qwest Fails to Include Area Codes for "Forward To" Numbers

Second, Qwest fails to provide on many CSRs the complete information CLECs need to order call forwarding, which WorldCom includes on every one of its orders for its standard product offering – the Neighborhood. When a CLEC places an order that includes call forwarding and the customer already has call forwarding, Qwest requires the CLEC to list the old number to which the customer forwarded calls, as well as the new number to which the customer now will forward calls. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 13. Qwest's documentation states that the old "forward to" number can be extracted from the CSR and pre-populated on the order. Id.

Unfortunately, that is not so in many cases. The "forward to" numbers on Qwest's CSRs sometimes include the area code but often do not. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 14. Qwest rejected WorldCom orders that did not include the area code in the "forward to" number even though WorldCom pulled the number directly from the CSR. Id. The rejects WorldCom received from Qwest stated that the orders were missing a call forwarding number in the form "nnn nnn-nnnn," indicating that a ten-digit number was expected. Id. While WorldCom cannot yet quantify with any certainty the percentage of Qwest CSRs that do not include the area code as part of the "forward to" number, and while Qwest has refused to provide such quantification, WorldCom can say that approximately 10% of its initial orders rejected as a result of the problem with the "forward to" numbers. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 16.

In conversations with Qwest, Qwest has acknowledged that the "forward to" number transmitted on a CLEC's order must include the area code even if the area code is not included on the CSR, and Qwest has acknowledged that its documentation did not make this clear. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 18. WorldCom has asked Qwest to implement a work-around, so that it does not require the area code. After all, Qwest should not need the old "forward to" number at all, since that is a number the customer will no longer be using. But Qwest has refused to implement such a work around. In response to WorldCom's request for a work-around, Qwest replied that "If there is a change to the call forwarding number, WorldCom needs to provide the area code." Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 18. Thus, not only did Qwest's erroneous documentation lead to development of flawed systems, but Qwest has refused to provide a way around the resultant problem. It has not "commit[ted] resources to prevent . . . problems" caused by its cumbersome ordering processes, as the Commission stated that it should.[25]

This is a major problem. WorldCom has built its systems to extract the "forward to" number from the CSR and transmit it. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 15. WorldCom's orders will therefore reject when the CSR does not include the area code. And even after the orders reject, it is not apparent how WorldCom can determine the area code. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 17. If WorldCom calls the customer and asks for the area code on the old "forward to" number, the customer will not understand why WorldCom is making such a request. Moreover, in many cases the customer will not know the old "forward to" number. If the customer forwarded calls to a Qwest voicemail platform, for example, the customer may not know the area code but rather may have programmed the number into an auto dialer and not be able to extract it. The burden should not be on the CLEC to identify a call forward number that is being changed upon migration.

The impact of the problem caused by Qwest's inconsistent inclusion of the area codes on the CSRs is magnified by the fact that Qwest apparently will not implement an industry-standard migrate-as-specified ordering process in April, as it repeatedly promised the Commission and by

[25] Qwest I Order ¶ 56.

which the Commission was "heartened" in granting the previous Qwest application.[26] In response to Qwest's prior section 271 applications, WorldCom repeatedly and emphatically explained the need for migrate-as-specified. Qwest responded that it intended to implement such a process in April in response to a CLEC change request. But Qwest has recently indicated that the process it implements in April will not work for "complex" features such as call forwarding. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 19. For these features, CLECs will be required to continue to list the feature detail information for the customer's existing features, as well as the feature detail information for the new features. Thus, the problem caused by the missing area codes will continue. Moreover, the other problems caused by Qwest's burdensome, non-standard process will continue as well.

C. Qwest Fails to Update Back-end Tables

Third, some WorldCom orders rejected because Qwest had not properly updated its back-end tables in Oregon. During WorldCom's EDI development, WorldCom asked Qwest whether it needed to send a "TTB" Universal Service Order Code ("USOC") to show that a customer desired touchtone service. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 20. Qwest said that such a USOC was required in three states, including Oregon. Id. But when WorldCom began transmitting orders with the TTB USOC, the Oregon orders rejected. Qwest informed WorldCom that perhaps it should not be sending the USOC after all. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 21. But then Qwest discovered that it had not properly updated tables in Oregon with the TTB USOC. Qwest has now updated the tables, and WorldCom orders that include the TTB USOC hopefully will no longer reject. Id. But this is nonetheless further evidence that Qwest's systems are at an early stage of development.

---

[26] Qwest I Order ¶ 58.

Moreover, when WorldCom re-started its systems on February 1 and again began transmitting orders, it received rejects that appeared similar to those for the TTB USOC. WorldCom received rejects based on the NKS and RCU USOCs. WorldCom is currently investigating with Qwest whether this is another problem with table updates or a documentation failure.

D. Qwest Fails to Enable CLECs to Access All Addresses in PREMIS

Fourth, some of WorldCom's orders rejected because of address errors. None of these orders would have rejected if Qwest had implemented migrate by telephone number, as WorldCom has explained in prior filings. Some also would not have rejected if Qwest provided better access to the address information the CLECs must include on the orders.

In its pre-order process, WorldCom attempts to retrieve the customer's address by entering the customer's telephone number into the service address validation function, as Qwest instructs CLECs to do. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 24. But the address validation inquiry often is not successful. If the telephone number that the CLEC enters is for a second line, the address validation inquiry will not return an address for that line. Id. WorldCom was surprised to learn this was so, as it is not true in any other BOC region and there is nothing in Qwest's documentation to indicate it is so. Id.

But Qwest has confirmed with WorldCom that its PREMIS database does not contain addresses for second lines. As a result, when WorldCom representatives enter telephone numbers for second lines into the address validation function, no address will be returned. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 25. The representatives therefore type the address onto the order. As a result of keying errors, some of these orders will reject.

This is a significant problem because many migration orders are for second lines. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 25. In the early stages of competition, customers frequently are willing to experiment by migrating second lines to CLECs even when they are not willing to migrate their primary lines. Thus, Qwest's deficient PREMIS database is one more important cause of the high level of rejects in the Qwest region.

E. Qwest Fails to Update CSRs in a Timely Manner

In addition to the rejects that WorldCom experienced on the initial production orders it transmitted using its own systems, WorldCom has also determined that the problem it has previously discussed with CSR updates is worse than Qwest led the Commission to believe. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 26. WorldCom explained in response to Qwest's prior applications that it is frequently necessary for CLECs to submit supplemental orders soon after submitting initial orders. But Qwest's processes prevent a CLEC from doing so through the normal ordering process until Qwest has updated the CSRs to reflect that the CLEC now owns the account, which Qwest admits takes three to five days on average, and which actually appears to take much longer based on WorldCom's initial review of the few orders that did complete when it transmitted them in January. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 27. But Qwest told the Commission that CLECs could submit supplemental orders in the interim simply by requesting manual handling of the orders.[27]

It is now clear, however, that the process Qwest previously touted does not work. WorldCom tried this process for the orders it submitted in January, and the orders rejected. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 27. And Qwest has now acknowledged that the process does not work. Id.

[27] Qwest I Order ¶ 59.

Instead, Qwest has said that if WorldCom wants to issue a supplemental order before a CSR has been updated, WorldCom must resubmit the "original" order with a different Purchase Order Number, must mark the LSR for manual handling, and must populate on the order the order number that Qwest returned on the original Firm Order Confirmation or Service Order Completion. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 28. This process is extremely complex, and WorldCom has no reason to believe it will be any more successful than the process Qwest previously suggested. Id. For one thing, it makes no sense why this process would work. Moreover, WorldCom's own systems are designed in such a way that it cannot resubmit an order that it has already submitted unless it cancels the original order. Id. Thus, Qwest's new version of a work-around process appears to make it entirely impractical for CLECs to place supplemental orders until CSRs have been updated. Qwest's delay in updating CSRs therefore remains a major problem. Id.

F. Qwest Provides Inaccurate Documentation

As described above, many of the problems that WorldCom has experienced with the initial orders it has transmitted have resulted in part from Qwest's poor documentation. WorldCom explained documentation difficulties during the course of the prior Qwest applications,[28] and Qwest agreed to meet with CLECs to discuss these problems beginning in December. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 30. But during those meetings, Qwest indicated that changes to its existing documentation would take thousands of hours and would detract from the resources available to implement CLEC change requests in change management. Id. This is absurd, as accurate documentation is a baseline requirement and should not preclude Qwest from making other important changes. Nonetheless, the CLECs agreed to limit their proposals to future documentation. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 31.

[28] Qwest I Order ¶ 54 n.180.

WorldCom provided Qwest with a list of guidelines Qwest should follow for its documentation going forward, based on the documentation problems it had already observed: (1) Explain any differences between interface functionality (EDI vs. GUI) or explain that functionality will never differ; (2) provide field level detail for both inquiry and response transaction that is now sometimes missing (what special characters apply); (3) provide all valid entries for each transaction type; (4) define acronyms; (5) define usage rules; (6) define references or provide links; (7) provide complete business rules; (8) clearly define restrictions; (9) provide business rules to support usage; (10) establish process to synch up EDI documentation (disclosure documents and appendices). Id. Qwest has not yet agreed to these basic principles, and there certainly is no evidence yet that Qwest is capable of following them.

G. Qwest's Failure to Meet Performance Metrics

Finally, we note that the deficiencies in Qwest's OSS described above for the most part do not show up in Qwest's performance metrics. But as seen in the spreadsheet attached hereto to the Lichtenberg declaration, Qwest's metrics do reveal other deficiencies with its OSS.[29] On a regionwide basis, Qwest's metrics show repeated failures to meet performance measures related to repair for UNE-P and line sharing, billing accuracy, E911, and other important performance metrics. Lichtenberg Decl. ¶ 32. This is yet more evidence of the deficiencies in Qwest's OSS.

Now that WorldCom's warnings about Qwest's OSS have proven demonstrably correct, the Commission should reject Qwest's new section 271 application. WorldCom will continue to document the OSS difficulties that will almost surely arise over the course of the 90-day review period. But it is already clear that WorldCom is correct – Qwest's OSS is the worst in the country and is simply not yet ready to support meaningful competition.

---

[29] We note that the spreadsheet does not include all of Qwest's missed performance metrics, only those that are particularly egregious or that are of particular interest to WorldCom.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Qwest's section 271 application for New Mexico, Oregon and South Dakota should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

__//s//__________________

Lori Wright
Associate Counsel
WorldCom, Inc.

Marc A. Goldman
JENNER & BLOCK, LLC
601 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 639-6000

Lori Wright
WorldCom, Inc.
1133 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 736-6468

February 5, 2003

Certificate of Service

I, Lonzena Rogers, hereby certify, that a true and correct copy of WorldCom, Inc. Comments in the matter of WC Docket No. 03-11 was served on this fifth day of February, 2003 on the following electronically:

Marlene Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Janice Myles
Wireline Competition Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554
jmyles@fcc.gov

Gary Remondino
Wireline Competition Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554
gremondi@fcc.gov

Kimberly Cook
Wireline Competition Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554
kcook@fcc.gov

Ryan Harsch
U.S. Department of Justice
Antitrust Division
Telecommunications and Media
Enforcement Section
1401 H Street, NW – Suite 8000

Washington, DC 20530
ryan.harsch@usdoj.gov

Anthony Medeiros
NMPRC
Marian Hall
224 East Palace Avenue
Santa Fe, NM 87501
Anthony.Medeiros@state.nm.us

David Booth, Program Manager
Competitive Issues
Public Utility Commission of Oregon
550 Capitol Street, NE
P.O. Box 2148
Salem, OR 97308-2148
dave.booth@state.or.us

Pam Bonrud
Executive Director
500 East Capitol
Pierre, SD 57401
pam.bonrud@state.sd.us

Karen Cremer
500 East Capitol
Pierre, SD 57401
karen.cremer@state.sd.us

Harlan Best
500 East Capitol
Pierre, SD 57401
harlan.best@state.sd.us

Rolayne Wiest
500 East Capitol
Pierre, SD 57401
rolayne.wiest@state.sd.us

Mace Rosenstein
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.
555 13th Street NW
Washington, DC 20004
mjrosenstein@hhlaw.com

Yaron Dori

Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.
555 13th Street NW
Washington, DC 20004
ydori@hhlaw.com

C. Jeffrey Tibbels L.L.P.
Hogan & Hartson
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
cjtibbels@hhlaw.com

Qualex International
Portals II
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW
Room CY-B402
Washington, DC 20554
qualexint@aol.com

_______/s/________
Lonzena Rogers